

.....
Theory
.....
and Empiricism
.....
in Slavonic
.....
Diachronic
.....
Linguistics
.....

.....
Edited by
.....
Ilona Janyšková
.....
& Helena Karlíková
.....

.....
Nakladatelství
.....
Lidové noviny
.....
Praha 2012
.....

The present volume was prepared with the support of a grant from the Czech Science Foundation “Theory and Empiricism in Slavonic Diachronic Linguistics” (Nr. P406/10/1346).

Studia etymologica Brunensia 15
Eds. Ilona Janyšková & Helena Karlíková

Reviewed by Radoslav Večerka and Stefan Michael Newerkla

© Ilona Janyšková, Helena Karlíková

ISBN 978-80-7422-185-9

ALEKSANDAR LOMA, JASNA VLAJIĆ-POPOVIĆ: THE COMMON SLAVIC *GOTOVŦ RECONSIDERED

Abstract: After a review of previous attempts to interpret the Common Slavic *gotovŦ ‘ready, prepared, finished’, Trubačev’s etymology, which traces it back to a supine in *-t(e)u-* from PIE *g^hā-/*g^hā- ‘to go’, is judged to be the only promising explanation and is further developed by the authors. They assume that underlying the Slavic adjective there is the dative of a proterokinetic verbal noun and compare the derivation of OInd. *participia necessitatis* in *-tava-*, perhaps also the Greek *-τέος*, from dative-based infinitives in **-teuei* > Vedic *-tave*, with the stress originally laid on the suffix syllable, which accounts for the zero-grade root vocalism of the Slavic word. **Keywords:** Slavonic languages, Balto-Slavic languages, etymology, word-formation, verbal nouns, supine, infinitive, PSl. *gotovŦ ‘ready’, PIE *g^heH₂-/*g^hH₂- ‘to go’.

o. The Common Slavic and Proto-Slavic adjective (**gotovŦ* ‘paratus, promptus; perfectus, finitus’ has been the object of much writing – it has entered all Slavic etymological dictionaries and it has been the focal point of several articles – but its etymology has not yet been resolved. It is a striking fact that in almost all dictionaries more space is given over to criticising and rejecting the comparisons and interpretations proposed thus far than to advocating and corroborating one of these or proposing a new solution. In this paper, after briefly revisiting earlier discussion, we shall focus on an interpretation already proposed but left incomplete and try to elaborate on its formal aspect in order to come closer to a reasonably acceptable etymological solution.

o.1. Main Slavic forms and reconstructs: The Common Slavic **gotovŦ*, *-a*, *-o* ‘ready, prepared, finished’, **(-)gotoviti*, *-vl’q* / **(-)gotovati*, *-ujq* (*se*) ‘to get ready, prepare (oneself), make (a meal)’ (OCSl. *готовѣъ*, *готововити*, *готововати*, Mac. *готовѣ*, *готовѣти*, Bulg. *готѣ*, *готѣя* SCR. *готѣ*, *готѣвити*, dial. *готѣвати*, Slov. *gotōv*, *-ōva*, *gotōviti*, Slk. *hotový*, *hotovať*, dial. *hotovit’i*, Cz. *hotový*, *hotoviti*, *hotovati*, USorb. *hotowy* (beside *hot*, cf. § 1.2), *hotowić*, *hotować*, LSorb. *gótowy*, *gótowaś*, Pol. *gotowy*, *gotów*, *gotowić*, *gotować*, Sln. *gotāvī*, *gotāc*, ORuss. *готовѣи*, *готовѣити*, *готовѣати*, Russ. *готѣвѣй*, *готѣвѣть*, Ukr. *готѣвий*, *готѣвити*, *готѣвати*, BRuss. *гатѣвы*, *гатѣвѣць*, *гатавѣць*.

1. IE parallels (and etymological attempts related to them)

1.o. Attempts to point to various non-Slavic parallels have not proven to be firmly grounded. They typically deal only with the roots of certain words, which are in turn usually problematic and/or isolated in their respective languages.

This paper has resulted from research on the project № 178007 “Etymological research of the Serbian language and compiling the *Etymological dictionary of Serbian*” which is fully financed by the Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Serbia.

1.1. Baltic parallels: Lith. *gātavas* ‘finished, ready’, *gatāvvyti* ‘to prepare, finish’, Latv. *gatavs*, *gatavāt(iēs)*, *gatavīt(iēs)* ‘id.’ is either borrowed from Slavic, with *gātavas* reflecting the Polish accent (Fraenkel 1962–1965, 1: 139b, Smoczyński 2007: 161), or cognate < BSl. **gatava-* (so recently Karulis 1992, 1: 292–294, cf. below § 2.1).

1.2. Albanian parallel: The Common Slavic primary ***gotъ* (o- or u-stem) as reflected in USorb. *hot* is rendered a counterpart to Alb. *gat(i)* ‘ready’. However, both Alb. and USorb. words are interpreted as secondary formations, *gat(i)* as a postverbal adjective from *gatuaj* ‘to make ready, prepare’ < Slavic *gotovati* or *gotoviti* (Orel 1998: 111), *hot* as built in Upper Sorbian by analogy with *přihot* ‘preparation’ ← *při-hotować* (Schuster-Šewc 1978–1989, 1: 334).

1.3. Germanic parallel: The Gothic *ga-taujan* pf. to *taujan* ‘to do, make’, with no etymology accepted (Lehmann 1986: 342) is proposed as a parallel to the Slavic adjective; the relationship Germanic *t* : Slavic *t* excludes their common inheritance from Proto-Indo-European and indicates a borrowing from one language into the other; *ga-* being a Germanic prefix, the direction of borrowing must have been from Germanic to Slavic.

1.3.1. The Goth. *gataujan* > **gotoviti* → **gotovъ* (Vaillant 1950–1974, 2: 528 ff.) is questionable.

1.3.1.1. The semantic objection: Ulfila’s and Slavonic translations do not match: Goth. *taujan* Mt 56.1 ‘ποιεῖν’ (Sl. *творити*), *gataujan* (e.g. Mt 5.36, Mk 6.5, Jo 11.37, Lk 5.34) ‘ποιῆσαι’ (Sl. *сътвори*); on the other hand, Sl. *gotovъ* ‘ἔτοιμος’, *готовити*, *-ати* ‘ἑτοιμάσαι’ (Goth. *manwus* adj. resp. (*ga-*)*manwjan* (im)pf.), cf. (missing from the Gothic Bible) Lk 12.47 *и не готовавъ ли не сътвори* for *μη ἑτοιμάσας ἢ ποιήσας*.¹

1.3.1.2. The morphological objection: The derivation **gotovъ* from **gotoviti* per se is not very probable (there are only a few late instances of postverbals in *-ov-* from the verbs in *-oviti*, e.g. SCr. *ц(ј)ело* from *цѣловати/-ivati*, Vaillant 1950–1974, 4: 258), thus **gotoviti* is generally admitted to be a deadjectival verb (ĚSSJa 7: 70, SP 8: 150; cf. § 1.3). The same derivational relationship appears in Greek: *ἔτοιμος* → *ἑτοιμάζειν* and the Gothic *manwus* → *manwjan*.

1.3.2. The Germanic ***gataws* > **gotovъ*? Given the lack of a corresponding adjective in Germanic, a nominal formation might be compared: OInd. *gṛtvar* f.pl., OE *getawu*, OHG *gizawa* f.sg., MHG *gezouwe* stn/f., NHG *Gezäh(e)* ‘tools, instruments’, and the OE *geatwe* ‘trappings [an ornamental covering or harness

1 Exceptionally Sl. *готовити*, Goth. *gamanwjan* translate Mt 11.10, Mk 1.2, Lk 7.27 *κατασκευάσαι* in the same meaning ‘prepare (the way)’, but cf. Lk 1.17 Sl. *готовити* *з(осподе)ви люди съвршени*, Goth. *manwjan frauĳin managein gafahrida* for *ἑτοιμάσαι κυρίῳ λαὸν κατασκευασμένον*.

for a horse]’ (Lehmann 1986: 342) and from the semantic point of view SCr. *готов конь* ‘settled, ready to start’ (of a horse, in an oral epic formula), Russ. *готовый конь, готовая лошадь* id., ORuss. *не бнь ему коня уготована* (Повесть об ослеплении Василия II, 15th century). But the original meaning here is not necessarily ‘equipped’, cf. below § 6.2.²

1.4. Other comparisons that do not help further.

1.4.1. Comparison with the Greek epic adjective *νηγάτεος* (Mladenov 1941: 107) sheds no further light since the Greek word itself is etymologically obscure. Not only its structure, but also its precise meaning remain elusive, and similarity with the Modern Greek *ανήγατος* ‘brand-new (of clothes)’ is probably coincidental (cf. Chantraine 1968–1980, 3: 750, Frisk 1973–1979, 2: 313). Recently Ruigh (1978: 95) suspects *νηγάτεος* to be of pre-Greek origin.

1.4.2. Connection with OInd. *ghátate* ‘endeavours, strives’,³ whose *ḡ* can hardly be traced back to PIE **t* (cf. KEWA: 355), should equally not be taken into account.

1.5. The derivation from PIE, **g^hā-/*g^hā-* ‘to go’ was proposed independently by P. Skok († 1956) in his posthumously published dictionary and by O. N. Trubačev in a paper from 1964.

1.5.1. Skok 1971–1974, 1: 596 departs from the perfect passive participle PIE **g^hā-tó-* (cf. § 2.1) adjectivised in the meaning ‘spreman za hod (ready for walking)’ both in Slavic and in “Illyro-Thracian” (by which Alb. *gat* is meant; but compare § 1.2!).

1.5.2. According to Trubačev 1964, there is an underlying *u*-stem genetically close to supine, namely PIE **g^hā-tu-*, with semantic parallels in Engl. *ready* from *ride*, Germ. *bereit* from *reiten* ‘to ride’, *fertig* from *fahren* ‘to travel’.⁴ Trubačev himself slightly reformulated his etymology in *ĖSSJa* 7/1980: 70–72, which was accepted, more or less explicitly, by Machek 1968: 179, Schuster-Šewc 1978–1989, 1: 334, *ESJS* 4/1994: 193, Snoj 2003: 184, but rejected in *SP* 8/2001: 151–152 as not convincing. Most recently, Boryś 2005: 175 avoided etymologisation of the adjective: “bez pewnej dalszej etymologii”.⁵

2 The similar case of Sl. **gorazdъ* ‘skilled, dexterous’, allegedly from the Germanic ***ga-razds* from Goth. *razda-* ‘tongue, speech, language’ (an old interpretation recently accepted in *ĖSSJa* 7: 32, but resolutely rejected in *SP* 8: 99) may illustrate the uncertainty of such etymological combinations.

3 Originally proposed by Machek 1937: 265–266, but later omitted from the respective lemma of his dictionary.

4 One could perhaps add Gk. *ἔτοιμος* ‘ready’ – if Prelwitz’s analysis of it as a compound with *οἶμος* ‘way, road, path’ is correct (cf. Frisk 1973–1979, 2: 313).

5 Rick Derksen even omitted it from his *Etymological Dictionary of the Slavic Inherited Lexicon*, Leiden–Boston 2008.

2. Our (preliminary) conclusion: the only etymology worth (re)considering is that of Trubačev.

Loma

Vlajić-

-Popović

2.1. The lexical problem: As the basis of **gotovъ* Trubačev takes a verbal form (supine) of a verb otherwise non-attested in Slavic (for nominal derivatives from the same root see below). However, it is known in Baltic: Lith. *góti* ‘to go’, Latv. *gāju* ‘I went’, *gāts* ‘gone’. Things get easier when the formation of the adjective is placed on a deeper Balto-Slavic level, which suggests that Lith. *gātavas*, Latv. *gatavs*, etc. (cf. § 1.1) are inherited words rather than borrowings from Slavic.

2.2. The phonetic problem, recognised by Trubačev himself, lies in the fact that (B)Sl. *ǣ* (> Sl. *o*) appears in the root syllable instead of the expected *ā*. The solution proposed by Machek 1968: 179 (a secondary short vocalism due to the assimilation of the second syllable) is neither convincing nor necessary. In fact, **g^hā-* poses no problems, at least theoretically. It is a normal zero-grade of **g^hā-*, reflecting, in terms of laryngeal theory, **g^heH₂-/*g^hH₂-*.

2.2.1. Because of the (already PIE) suppletivism of **g^heH₂-/*g^hH₂-* (LIV 1: 205) with **g^hem-/*g^hom-/*g^hm-* (LIV 1: 209–210), there is an uncertainty in deriving several forms from one root or another, e.g. PPP Gk. *βατός* = OInd. *gatá-*, Lat. *-ventus* < **g^hmtós* or = OIr. *-bath* < **g^hH₂tós*. In nominal derivatives, **g^hH₂-* appears before a vowel in the second element of a compound, with the subsequent loss of the laryngeal, **-g^hH₂-ó-* in Ved. *su-gá-* ‘easy to traverse’, **-g^hH₂-u-* in Ved. *vanar-gú-* ‘roaming in the forest’, Gk. *πρέσ-θυς, πρεῖ-γυς* ‘old man, elderly’, Lith. *žmo-gùs* ‘man’ (NIL: 174–175). In the derivatives, however, the strong stem **g^hH₂-* > **g^hā-* usually occurs before a consonant, cf. in **(e)i-*: Sl. **gatъ* ‘causeway; dam, weir’, Latv. *gāts* (an *i*-stem, n.pl. *gātis*) ‘walk, passage’ (both genetically identical with Lith. infinitive *góti*, cf. Sl. verbal noun **mogtъ* ‘power’, loc. *mogti* = inf. *mogti* ‘to can’), in *-(e)u-*: Ved. *gātu-* ‘going, way, course’, OAv. *gātu-* id. (genetically identical with the Vedic infinitive *gātave*), perhaps also Sl. **gatъ* ‘causeway; dam, weir’, assuming that it was originally an *u*-stem.

2.2.2. However, there is Lith. *gātvė*, Latv. *gatva, gatuve* ‘street, lane, cattle-track’ traditionally derived from Goth. **gatwo* (e.g. Fraenkel 1962–1965, 1: 139–140). The Gothic word⁶ is related to OInd. *gata* f. ‘path, street’, MLG *gate* ‘lane, street’, OHG *gazza* ‘lane’, but hardly explainable from Germanic sources (Lehmann 1986: 151a: “Etymology obscure”), whereas in Baltic the words can be easily derived from the PIE root **g^h(e)H₂-* ‘to go’, which would not have resulted in the Germanic *ga-*. Therefore, if a borrowing has taken place, which is prob-

6 It is a hapax, only Lk. 14.21 in *gatwons* jah staigos baurgs for εἰς τὰς πλατείας καὶ ρύμας τῆς πόλεως, cf. OCSl. на распъжтѣи и стѣгны града, Lat. in *plateas* et vicus civitatis.

able, it could only have been in the direction from Baltic to Germanic, and not inversely. (Karulis 1992, 1: 294–295 assumes that the word was borrowed by old Norsemen at the beginning of the Christian era).

2.2.3. The Proto-Baltic **gātvā* is best explained as having been thematised from a *u*-stem related to the Indo-Iranian **gātu-*, from which it differs only in the quantity of the root syllable, but which, in this particular instance, matches the Proto-Slavic supine assumed to underlie **gotovъ* (or an already Balto-Slavic **gatavas*). So we have an additional argument supporting reconstruction of the Balto-Slavic **gātu-*.

3. Is the doublet **gātu-/gātu-* probable from the standpoint of PIE word-formation?

3.1. Stems ending in *-tu-* in Vedic show vocal alternation in the suffix (**-te-* > *-to-*, *-tav-*), but not in the root. For example, the verbal noun assuming the role of the infinitive of the verb *váyati* ‘weaves’ is the acc. *ótum*, dat. *ótave* with an analogical extension of the strong stem with its accent. Yet the original inflection of PIE *u*- and *i*-stems is supposed to have been of the so-called proterokinetic type, with a stress alternation between root and suffix, the accented syllables displaying the full *e*-grade and the unaccented ones the zero-grade (cf. Meier-Brügger 2002: 209). Hence, we have in the strong cases (nom./acc.) **éu-tu-s*, **éu-tu-m* > *ótum*, and in the weak cases (those with a stress on the suffix) we have gen. **u-téu-s* > *utóh*, dat. **u-té-ei* > *utáve* (cf. Kuipert 1942: 473).

3.2. Consequently, vis-à-vis the nom./acc. *gātuḥ*, *gātum* with the primary *e*-grade of the root and the zero-grade of the suffix (PIE **g^uéH₂-tu-s/m*), the dat. *gátave* is judged to be secondary instead of **gitáve* < **g^uH₂-téu-ei*. In Balto-Slavic, where the change PIE **e* > **o* before **u* took place, the original alternation would have been between the strong stem *gātu-* (probably **gatъ* ‘causeway, etc.’) and the weak one *gatáv-*, upon which **gatavas* > **gotovъ* is presumably based.

4. Rigvedic evidence

4.1. The dat. *gátave* occurs only once in Rigveda and does not belong to the paradigm of *gātu-* ‘way’, but acts as the infinitive of the suppletive verb *gā-/gam-* ‘to go’. The grammatical category of infinitives (and supines) was unknown to Proto-Indo-European, hence Vedic reflects the early stage of its development, with 16 various nominal formations in the infinitive function. The infinitive constructions in the dative largely prevail (more than 600 instances from a total of 700 in RV) and the verbal nouns in *-t(e)u-* play a prominent

role (datives in *-tave* from 30 verbal roots, accusatives in *-tum* from 5, with the latter construction providing the only suffix for constructing the infinitive in Classical Sanskrit, and supine in Latin and Slavic).

4.2. Beside the hapax *gātave* there are three Rigvedic examples of the synonymous *gántave* derived from the suppletive root *gam-* (according to Grassmann's dictionary). In all these instances, the basic meaning of the final dative 'for going, for to go' is transparent.

The relevant passages are (along with translations, English by R. Griffith, German by K. F. Geldner, Russian by T. Ja. Elizarenkova):

III 3.1a: *Vaiśvānarāya pṛthupājase vípo rátnā vidhanta dharúṇeṣu gātave* "To him who shines afar, Vais'va-nara, shall bards give precious things **that he may go** on certain paths / Dem Vaisvanara von breiter Gestalt weihen sie die Redeperlen, **um** auf sicherem Grunde **zu wandeln** / Ваишванаре с широкой грудью они посвятили слова-сокровища, **чтобы добратся** до оснований (закона)".

I 46.7a: *á no navá matínāṃ yātám pārāya gántave* "Come in the ship of these our hymns **to bear** you to the hither shore / Kommt auf dem Schiff unserer Gedanken, **um** ans andere Ufer **zu gelangen** / Приезжайте на ладе наших мыслей, **чтобы отправиться** на тот берег".

x 95.14: *sudevó adyá prapáted ánavṛt parāvátam paramám gántavá u* "Thy lover shall flee forth this day for ever, **to seek**, without return, the farthest distance / Liefе heute dein Abgott davon auf Nimmerwiederkehr, **um** in die fernste Ferne **zu gehen**".⁷

x 160.5: *aśvāyánto gavyánto vājáyanto hávāmahe tvópagantavá u* "We call on thee **to come** to us, desirous of goods and spoil, of cattle, and of horses / Rosse, Rinder, Siegerpreise begehrend rufen wir dich an, **herbeizukommen** / Жажда коней, жажда коров, жажда наград, мы призываем тебя, **чтобы ты пришел**".

5. The derivational aspect of Trubačev's etymology

5.1. On the basis of Vedic infinitives ending in *-tave*, Classical Sanskrit developed a gerundive (participium necessitatis) in *-tavya-*, e.g. *mayā* (instr.) *gantavyam* (nom.sg.n.) 'I should go, mihi eundum est'.⁸

⁷ This hymn is not included into the translation by Elizarenkova.

⁸ There is also an older Indo-Iranian formation in *-tu-o-* from the full-grade root: OInd. *hán-tv-as*, Av. *jaθθō* 'necandus'.

5.2. The Greek participia necessitatis in -τέος are supposed to be of similar origin. Traditionally, they are connected with Vedic final infinitives in *-tave* < **-teuei* and the Sanskrit gerundive in *-tavya-*, presuming that *-τέος* derives from **-τέφος* or **-τέφιος* (Schwyzer 1939: 811, following J. Wackernagel, assumes that the adjectivisation of *tu*-abstracts in the dative correspond to OInd. *-tave*, *-tavai* and OPruss. *-twei* (cf. also Chantraine 1933: 308; Rix 1976: 237). Fraenkel 1952: 31 assumes a formation akin to Gk. *δίκτυον* ‘net’, OCSl. *žetva*, *kletva*, and Lith. *kirstūvas* ‘axe’ beside *plaktavas* ‘beater, hammer’, but on the other hand compares the Hesiodic *φατειός* to Skt. participia necessitatis in *-tavya-*.⁹ If that is so, the Greek verbal adjective (*δια-*, *κατα-*) *βατέον* could be regarded as a formation akin to **gotov̥* < *g^uH₂teuos* although its root is more probably the suppletive **g^uem-* (*βατ-* < **g^umt-* cf. § 2.2.1).

5.2.1. Recently, on the basis of Myc. *qetejo* interpreted as *k^ueteion* ‘to pay’ (from the root of the alphabetic Greek *τίνω*), a new hypothesis has been put forward, deriving the adjectives ending in *-τέος* not from the verbal nouns in **-t(e)u-* but from those in **-t(e)i-* (Lejeune 1971: 304–306). However, according to Baumbach 1971: 182, this interpretation might be erroneous compared to the more traditional etymology linking the Gk. adjectives in *-τέος* with Skt. gerundives in *-tavya-*, especially because of the retention of *-τέος* without a contraction in Attic, which is hard to explain if a *w* was not originally present between *e* and *o*. Even if this was the case, they provide at least a structural parallel to the Indo-Iranian gerundives derived from the *-t(e)u-* stems, as well as to the interpretation of **gotov̥* discussed here.

5.3. In the prehistory of the Slavic and Baltic languages, verbal nouns ending in **-t(e)u-* and **-t(e)i-* must have played a role similar to that attested in Vedic. The latter yielded infinitives in *-t(ē)i*, (Sl. *-ti*, Lith. *-ti*, *-tie*, Latv. *-t*, *-tie*, and OPruss. *-t*), whereas the former produced the supine in **-tum* > OCSl. *-tъ*, Lith. *-tu*, and the OPruss. (inf.) *-tun*, based on their accusative, but also the OPruss. infinitive in *-twei* reflecting their dative (with a zero-grade of the suffix, cf. Szemerényi 1980: 340).

6. Some semantic observations

A thorough study of the usage of **gotov̥* and its derivatives in Slavic languages, focusing on their earliest literary attestations and the formulaic expressions of the oral tradition, would contribute considerably to further discussion of its

9 The latter reconstruction is based on the first occurrence of such a participle *φατειός* in Hesiod, where *ει*, however, may be due to a metrical lengthening (Fraenkel l.c.).

etymology, but such a task goes well beyond the scope of this paper. Departing from the etymology advocated here, the most rewarding option seems to be research in the following directions:

6.1. Verbal connections of the adjective. The supine being used primarily with verbs of motion, constructions such as the OCSl. (Marian Codex) *съ тобоѡж зотовъ есмъ и въ темьницѡж и въ смърть ити* for *ἔτοιμός εἰμι καὶ εἰς φυλακὴν καὶ εἰς θάνατον πορεύεσθαι* Lk 22.33;

6.2. Oral formulas, e.g. **gotovъ ko(mo)n'ъ* (cf. § 1.3.2): **‘a horse ready to start’*;

6.3. Verbal constructions using ‘road, way, path’ as an object: OCSl. *оуготовити нѡжть* (Mt 11.10, Mk 1.2, 1.3, etc., Lk 3.4, 7.27): **‘make fit for walking’*, cf. in The Tale of Igor’s campaign *а половци неготовами дорогами побъгоша к Дону* (by Trubačev 1974: 55 and in ËSSJa l.c. translated as ‘непригодными для езды, непроходимыми’ and ‘нехоженными’ respectively).

7. Conclusion

As corroborated by the additional observations presented here, the derivation proposed by Trubačev appears to fit perfectly into the general idea of the morphological, lexical and semantic processes which, in the prehistory of the Indo-European languages, including Balto-Slavic, led to the transformation of PIE verbal nouns – i.e. some of their cases – into new verbal categories, infinitives and supines. These subsequently served as a basis for the formation of verbal adjectives – including the PSl. **gotovъ*.

References

- Baumbach 1971: Baumbach, L., The Mycenaean Greek Vocabulary II. *Glotta* 49, 151–190.
Boryś 2005: Boryś, W., *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego*, Kraków.
Buck 1965: Buck, C. D., *A Dictionary of Selected Synonyms in the Principal Indo-European Languages*, Chicago.
Chantraine 1933: Chantraine, P., *La formation des noms en grec ancien*, Paris.
Chantraine 1968–1980: Chantraine, P., *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*, 1–4, Paris.
Chantraine 1973: Chantraine, P., *Morphologie historique du grec*, Paris.
Elizarenkova 1982: Елизаренкова, Т. Я., *Грамматика ведийского языка*, Москва.
ESJS: *Etymologický slovník jazyka staroslověnského*, 1–, Praha 1989–2008, Brno 2010–.
ËSSJa: *Этимологический словарь славянских языков*, 1–, Москва 1974–.
Fraenkel 1952: Fraenkel, E., Zur griechischen Wortbildung, *Glotta* 32, 16–33.
Fraenkel 1962–1965: Fraenkel, E., *Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 1–2, Göttingen.
Frisk 1973–1979: Frisk, H., *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 1–3, Heidelberg.
Grassmann 1976: Grassmann, H., *Wörterbuch zum Rig-Veda*, Wiesbaden.
Karulis 1992: Karulis, K., *Latviešu etimoloģijas vārdnīca*, 1–2, Riga.
KEWA: Mayrhofer, M., *Kurzgefaßtes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen*, 1–4, Heidelberg 1956–1980.

- Kuiper 1942: Kuiper, F. B. J., *Notes on Vedic noun-inflexion*, Amsterdam, reprint: *Selected Writings on Indian Linguistics and Philology*, Amsterdam – Atlanta GA 1997, 439–530.
- Lehmann 1986: Lehmann, W. P., *A Gothic Etymological Dictionary*, Leiden.
- Lejeune 1971: Lejeune, M., *Mémoires de la philologie mycénienne* 2, Rome.
- LIV: *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben. Die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstambildungen*. Unter Leitung von H. Rix, Wiesbaden ²2001.
- Machek 1937: Machek, V., *Ario-Slavica, Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung auf dem Gebiete der indogermanischen Sprachen* LXIV, 261–266.
- Machek 1968: Machek, V., *Etymologický slovník jazyka českého*, Praha.
- Meier-Brügger 2002: Meier-Brügger, M., *Indogermanische Sprachwissenschaft*. 8., überarbeitete und ergänzte Auflage der früheren Darstellung von H. Krahe, unter Mitarbeit von M. Fritz u. M. Mayrhofer, Berlin – New York.
- Mladenov 1941: Младенов, С., *Етимологически и правописен речник на българския книжовен език*, София.
- NIL: Wodtko, D. S. – Irslinger, B. – Schneider, C., *Nomina im Indogermanischen Lexikon*, Heidelberg 2008.
- Orel 1998: Orel, V., *Albanian Etymological Dictionary*, Leiden etc.
- Palmer 1977: Palmer, L. R., *The Latin Language*, London.
- Poljakov 1995: Poljakov, O., *Das Problem der balto-slavischen Sprachgemeinschaft*, Heidelberg.
- Rix 1976: Rix, H., *Historische Grammatik des Griechischen. Laut- und Formenlehre*, Darmstadt.
- Ruigh 1978: Ruigh, C. J., Review of Chantraine III, *Lingua* 44, 93–103.
- Schuster-Šewc 1978–1989: Schuster-Šewc, H., *Historisch-etymologisches Wörterbuch der ober- und niedersorbischen Sprache*, 1–4, Bautzen.
- Schwyzler 1939: Schwyzler, A., *Griechische Grammatik I. Lautlehre, Wortbildung, Flexion*, München.
- Skok 1971–1974: Skok, P., *Etimologijski rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika*, 1–4, Zagreb.
- Sławski 1952–1982: Sławski, F., *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego*, 1–5, A–Żywy, Kraków.
- Snoj 2003: Snoj, M., *Slovenski etimološki slovar*, Ljubljana.
- Smoczyński 2007: Smoczyński, W., *Słownik etymologiczny języka litewskiego*, Wilno.
- SP: *Słownik prasłowiański*, 1–, Wrocław etc. 1974–.
- Szemerényi 1980: Семереньи, О., *Введение в сравнительное языкознание*, Москва.
- Vaillant 1950–1974: Vaillant, A., *Grammaire comparée des langues slaves*, 1–4, Lyon – Paris.
- Trubačev 1964: Трубачев, О. Н., Славянские этимологии 40. слав. *gotovъ*. In: *Prace filologiczne* 28, Warszawa, 153–156. Reprinted in: *Труды по этимологии. Слово. История. Культура*, том 1, Москва 2004, 635–638.
- Trubačev 1974: Трубачев, О. Н., Этимология и текст. In: *Современные проблемы литературоведения и языкознания*, Москва, 448–454. Reprinted in: *Труды по этимологии. Слово. История. Культура*, том 1, Москва 2004, 54–60.

Још једном о словенском *gotovъ. Након прегледа досадашњих покушаја тумачења псл. придева *gotovъ ‘promptus, paratus, finitus’, аутори просуђују да је Трубачовљево извођење од супина на *-t(e)u-*, пореклом од пие. *g^hā-/g^hā- ‘ићи’, једино перспективно и вредно даље развијања. Претпостављају да у основи словенског придева лежи датив протерокинетичке глаголске именице, те ту творбу пореде са староиндијским *participia necessitatis* на *-tavua-*, евентуално и са грчким на *-téos*, од датива пореклом од инфинитива на **-tecei* (> ведски *-tave*), чији је акценат првобитно био на суфиксалном слогу, чиме се објашњава нулска база у корену словенске речи.

Aleksandar Loma • loma.aleksandar@gmail.com
 Filozofski fakultet, Čika Ljubina 18, 11000 Beograd, Srbija
 Jasna Vlajić-Popović • jasna.vlajic@isj.sanu.ac.rs
 Institut za srpski jezik SANU, Knez-Mihailova 36/1, 11000 Beograd, Srbija